

Serial No. 10/623,330

- 5 -

62903sh

REMARKS

But for the cancellation of claim 16 with traverse, the remaining claims of this application are being resubmitted in unamended form on the grounds that the cited references do not anticipate in the opinion of the undersigned.

Claims 1-4, 7, 17, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over deAngelis ('193). Other possible comparisons notwithstanding, Applicant contends that this reference fails to meet the limitation of "generating tool paths associated with the material addition and subtraction processes." In this regard, the Examiner refers to column 7, lines 30-35 and column 8, lines 32-35, as purportedly reading on tool path generation for both additive and subtractive processes, but these sections fall short of such disclosure. Column 7, lines 30-35 is not only limited to additive processes, but the reference to "control contours" do not teach *tool path generation*, but rather, are "provided by selectively deposited and extracted complimentary materials or by precut masks." Anticipation has not been established for this reason alone. Nonetheless, turning to column 8, lines 32-35, the reference to "control contours," again, do not suggest tool path generation. Indeed, it is "the use of control contours in the additive process determines the amount of subtractive processing required to arrive within geometric tolerance of the desired part layer." This is not a separate tool path generation for subtractive processing.

Claim 1 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Rebello et al. Again, however, with respect to Applicant's positively decided claim limitation of tool path generation for both additive and subtractive processes, the Examiner cited column 3, lines 9-10, which read "exemplary machines that include tool path generation." Although tool path generation is discussed, this is only with respect to a material removal step. Note column 3, lines 5-7, which state that material removal steps include "machining, EDM, or ECM." Thus, this reference is strictly limited to tool path generation for removal steps in general, and machining in particular. Given that anticipation requires the teaching of each and every element of a claim in a single reference, anticipation has not been established, and since the dependent claims add further limitations, they should be deemed allowable as well.

Based upon the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant believes all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Questions regarding this application may be directed to the undersigned by telephone, facsimile or electronic mail.

Serial No. 10/623,330

- 6 -

62903sh

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John G. Posa

Reg. No. 37,424

Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle,

Anderson & Citkowski, PC

PO Box 7021

Troy, MI 48007-7021

(734) 913-9300 FAX (734) 913-6007

Email: jposa@patlaw.com

Dated: March 29, 2006

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 617-6000